

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 12 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-23 will be pending herein upon entry of this Amendment. Support for the amendment to each of the claims can be found, for example, at page 1, line 22 to page 2, line 16 of the present application. For the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Final Office Action mailed, claims 1, 5-6, 12, 16-17 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Willis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,082). Claims 2-4, 7-10, 13-15, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,082), in view of Cragun et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,973,683). To the extent this rejection might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, it is respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 1, 12 and 23, claims 1, 12 and 23 recite, in part, “receiving from a network client...a request for publication of one or more media source programs in one or more encoding formats,” and “in response to receiving the request, capturing the one or more traditional media source programs from a traditional media source that broadcasts the one or more traditional media source programs at a particular broadcast time to a broadcasting area of the traditional media source,” and “ After being “captured,” the traditional

media source program that is selected by the network client is then encoded and published to that network client “located outside the broadcasting area of the traditional media source.”

The specification of the present application defines at page 1, line 22 to page 2, line 3 that “traditional media source programs” refer to “video and audio programs obtained from traditional sources, including but not limited to television network programs, satellite, cable, video programs and audio programs.”

Willis does not appear to relate to traditional media source programs, but rather relates to “utilizing satellite broadcast technology as a bridge between telephony operations and the Internet” (col. 1, lines 24-27).

Accordingly, Willis does not teach or suggest a method in which particular media programs that are selected by an individual network client are “captured” from a traditional media source for encoding. In Willis, all of the files for transmission are already “captured.” This is fundamentally distinct from claims 1, 12 and 23, which expressly recite that the particular programs are captured at a particular broadcast time. In that regard, as recited in the claims, only those traditional media source programs that are desired to be published to a network client are captured. Such selectivity simply is not suggested in Willis. While claims 1, 12 and 23 are directed to performing a method in response to selections from a particular client, Willis is directed to a multicasting system for a plurality of destination computers.

In addition, Willis does not teach or suggest that programs to be captured are broadcast at a particular broadcast time “to a broadcasting area of the traditional media source” and published to the “network client located outside the broadcasting area of the traditional media source.” The

present application describes at page 2, that viewers in a geographic region may wish to watch local programs of another geographic region. However, the cost of broadcasting traditional media source programs throughout the world is prohibitive. Claims 1, 12 and 23 recite a method, computer readable medium, and system, respectively, for capturing a traditional media source program broadcast to a broadcasting area and publishing the program to a client located outside the broadcasting area.

Because Willis et al. does not teach each and every limitation of claims 1, 12 and 23, the § 102(e) rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. The § 102(e) rejection of claims 5, 6, 16 and 17 should be withdrawn as well, at least in view of their dependence from claims 1 and 12, respectively.

Cragun et al., which discloses a user-friendly method for controlling content displayed on a television, does not cure the deficiencies of Willis et al. Because a combination of Willis et al. and Cragun et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every recitation required by dependent claims 2-4, 7-10, 13-15 and 18-21, the § 103(a) rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Serial No. 09/502,377
Art Unit: 2155

Attorney's Docket No. LET-103-RI
Page 13

SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: November 5, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

TOBIAS ET AL.

By: Tara L. Hutchings
Tara L. Hutchings
Registration No. 46,559

Attachments:

TLH/rss

Customer No. 28970

Document #: 1303342 v.1